

## Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending. In the Office Action, claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as including a limitation with insufficient antecedent basis, and claims 1-11, 14, 17, 18, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garney, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,015).

It was also stated that claims 12, 13, 15, 16 and 19-20 were objected to but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 6 and 7 to overcome the §112 rejections. Applicant respectfully traverses the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-11, 14, 17, 18, 23 and 24 as being unpatentable over Garney.

Claims 6 and 7 are amended to replace the term “printer” with the term “peripheral device”. As the peripheral device is properly introduced in claim 1 upon which claim 4 depends, and since claims 6 and 7 both depend upon claim 4, Applicant submits that these amendments overcome the §112 rejections. Applicant requests withdrawal of the §112 rejections of claims 6 and 7.

Applicant respectfully traverses the §103(a) rejection of claims 1-11, 14, 17, 18, 23 and 24 as being unpatentable over Garney.

The architecture and functionality as disclosed in Garney is substantially different from that recited in claim 1. With reference to Garney’s abstract and Figure 4, Garney describes a universal serial bus (USB) system including a first host controller and a second host controller which interfaces a HUB as a USB device. As further described in Garney’s

Abstract, the second host controller, in one embodiment, is a wireless host controller which includes a wireless remote module containing host controller circuitry. With reference to Garney's Figure 4, and column 6, line 15, Garney inserts a host controller 420 between a downstream port of HUB 250 and an upstream port of HUB 431. The host controller 420 appears to the primary host controller 240 as another USB device coupled to a downstream port of the HUB 250. However, since host controller 420 includes host controller circuitry, host controller 420 also appears as a host controller to downstream devices including HUB 431. The focus of Garney is to provide a second host controller to expand a USB network, wireless or not.

In contrast, claim 1 recites first and second transceivers coupled between USB ports of a computer and peripheral device which cooperate to form a wireless USB bus link between the computer and the peripheral device. The wireless USB bus link so formed is effectively transparent to the computer system, does not require host circuitry, does not appear as a device to the primary host controller, and does not appear as a host controller to the peripheral device. Instead, the wireless USB bus link as recited in claim 1 is transparent so that the computer otherwise "sees" it is connected via a wired connection to the peripheral device and vice-versa.

Applicant respectfully submits, therefore, that claim 1 is allowable over Garney and requests withdrawal of this rejection. Claims 2-11 and 14 are also allowable as depending upon allowable claim 1. Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Claim 17 is allowable for similar reasons as recited above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claim 17 recites radio frequency transceiver apparatus for providing a

wireless USB bus, which operates transparently in the USB system and does not require host controller circuitry and does not operate as a USB device. Claim 18 is allowable as depending upon claim 17.


Applicant submits that claim 23 is allowable over Garney for similar reasons as recited above with respect to claim 1. In particular, claim 23 recites a method for transmitting data over a USB bus from a computer to a peripheral device comprising acts of providing a first transceiver and a second transceiver between the computer and the peripheral device and establishing a wireless USB bus link between the first and second transceivers. Again, the bus link operates transparently in the USB system and does not act as a USB device nor does it require host circuitry as required in Garney. In this manner, claims 23 and 24 are allowable over Garney, and Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections.

### Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks and for various other reasons, Applicant submits that the application and claims are in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 22, 1999

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary R. Stanford  
Reg. No. 35,689